

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8-12 and 16-17 have been amended.

Claims 1, 4 and 6-17 are now pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action mailed December 23, 2003, the Examiner drew a line through JP-A-11-53587 dated February 26, 1999 on the PTO-1449 filed March 21, 2001. Again, the Applicant's respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge and consider this reference.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 4 AND 6-17 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101:

Independent claims 1, 8-12 and 16-17 have been amended. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1, 4 and 6-17 is overcome.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 4, 6-17 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER KAMINISKY ET AL. (US PATENT APPLICATION PUBLICATION NO. 2001/00447308; HEREINAFTER "KAMINISKY"):

The Applicants respectfully submit that Kaminisky fails to recite "...providing a discount price transition table to a purchaser's terminal via a network, said table indicates dates and discount prices, wherein each discount price corresponds to said each date; accepting, a purchase reservation from said purchaser's terminal via the network specified with a date among the dates indicated in said discount transition table," as recited in amended claim 1.

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Kaminisky discloses at paragraph [0050] "providing a discount price rule for a purchaser. The Applicants respectfully submit that Kaminisky discloses the discount price rule being formulated by a seller. That is, Kaminisky does not disclose this discount price rule being presented to or provided for a purchaser.

Instead, as shown in FIG. 3 of Kaminisky, a purchaser is provided a display. However, the display does not contain any information representing or relating to prices offered to a purchaser for a future time in a manner wherein the price continuously reduces by a percentage, after elapsing over a period of time. Instead, the display in FIG. 3 of Kaminisky merely discloses a retail price, a current price and an offer end date and price trend for a specified product. That is, Kaminisky does not disclose the Applicants "discount price transition table" to a purchaser.

Therefore, Kaminisky fails to provide the advantage of allowing a purchaser to know what a price will be for a specified product on a specified future date as in the present invention.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Accordingly, claims 1, 4 and 6-17 patentably distinguish over Kaminisky. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

Jan 19, 2005

By:

Deidre M. Davis

Deidre M. Davis

Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501